

## REMARKS

Claims 1-116 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### Double Patenting Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-116 under the judiciary created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Pat. No.: 7,065,579. Applicants traverse this rejection on the grounds that the Examiner has not stated a *prima facie* rejection.

According to MPEP 804.II.B.1, “the analysis employed in an obviousness-type double patenting determination parallels the guidelines for a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection.” This section of the MPEP also states that the same “factual inquires ... that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are employed when making an obviousness-type double patenting analysis.” MPEP 804.II.B.1 also states that the Examiner should list the differences between each rejected claim and the claims of the other patent/application, and for each difference the Examiner should give the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim of the other patent/application. Just like for a §103 rejection, these reasons should be supported by evidence of record.

**In the present Office Action**, the Examiner has provided a table that the Examiner claims shows the similarity of the claimed inventions of application number 10/055,773 and U.S. Pat. No. 7,065,579. (Specifically, of claim 1 of the instant application and claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 7,065,579). All the Examiner has actually done is taken elements of claim 1 of the instant application and placed them side-by-side with large portions of claim 1 of 7,065,579. **As can easily be seen from the Examiner’s own table, there are many differences between the claims. The Examiner has not**

**provided reasons or evidence showing that all of the differences would be obvious, as is required to state a *prima facie* double patenting rejection per MPEP 804.II.B.1.**

The Examiner has given no reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim of the instant application is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim of the other patent/application beyond “the peer computing system of the instant application would have processor, network interface, and memory because it would enable the plurality of peer nodes to communicate and exchange information with each other in the network environment”, which clearly does not provide sufficient reason for the many other differences in the claims, and does not establish obviousness. Simply providing a side-by-side table comparing two claims that have many differences is not a valid reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim of the other patent/application. The Examiner has not stated proper grounds for rejection.

Nor has the Examiner specifically addressed **each difference of each rejected claim** of the present application compared to the claims of the other applications. Instead, the Examiner improperly lumped all the claims together and did not address each specific difference. For instance, the Examiner fails to address the differences in scope between Applicants’ various independent claims. Instead, the Examiner merely states that claims 36, 53, 55-59, 73, 75-77, 97, 99-101 and 114-116 “are also directed to the same subject matter recited in claim 1.” Thus, the Examiner has not addressed the differences between the rejected claims 36, 53, 55-59, 73, 75-77, 97, 99-101 and 114-116 and the claims of the 7,065,579 patent.

Additionally, the Examiner rejects dependent claims 2-35, 37-52, 60-72, 74, 78-96, 98 and 102-112 because “they depend from rejected claims.” This is not a valid basis for rejection. The Examiner does not attempt to list any differences between these claims and the claims of the ‘579 patent. Nor does the Examiner attempt to give reasons why one of ordinary skill would conclude that these claims are obvious variations of the claims of the ‘579 patent.

The Examiner clearly has not met the requirements stated in MPEP 804.II.B.1 to establish a *prima facie* obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the double patenting rejection of claims 1-116.

**Section 102(e) Rejection:**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8-13, 15, 17-22, 25-30, 32-38, 40, 42, 44, 45, 47-60, 62, 63, 65-80, 82-84, 86, 87, 89, 90, 92-101, 103, 104, 106-108 and 110-116 as being anticipated by Weisman et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0112058) (hereinafter “Weisman”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons below.

**The rejection is improper because Weisman is not a prior art reference.** More specifically, the Weisman publication was filed on June 1, 2001, after Applicants’ priority date of April 24, 2001. Weisman does claim the benefit of a provisional application filed December, 1, 2000. However, the December, 1, 2000 filing date can only be used as Weisman’s 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) prior art date for the subject matter that is common to both the Weisman publication and the provisional application. A review of Weisman’s provisional application reveals that it varies considerably from Weisman’s published utility application. Unless the Examiner can prove that the subject matter on which the Examiner is relying on to reject Applicants’ claims is also entirely present in Weisman’s provisional application, the rejection is improper. *See, In re Wertheim*, 209 USPQ 554 (CCPA 1981).

For example, Weisman’s provisional application appears to be a reference manual to using the UPnP API. However, Weisman’s provisional application does not appear to disclose or mention, anything regarding using the UPnP API for peer-to-peer networking purposes, as relied on by the Examiner in the rejection of Applicants’ claims.

Moreover, the Weisman publication is not entitled to the June 30, 1999 date as a section 102(e) prior art date unless at least one claim of the Weisman published application is supported (under 35 U.S.C. § 112) in the provisional application. Under 35 U.S.C. 119(e)(1), an application is not entitled to a provisional application's filing date as a prior art date unless at least one claim of the published utility application is supported (per 35 U.S.C. § 112) in the provisional application. Weisman's provisional application does not appear to fully support the claims of Weisman's utility application. For example, Weisman's provisional application does not appear to support peer networking protocol limitations of claim 1 in Weisman's utility application.

The rejection is improper unless the Examiner can show that Weisman's published application has the necessary claim support in the provisional application to be entitled to the provisional application's filing date as its § 102(e) prior art date. *See also* M.P.E.P. § 2136.03(IV). Since the Examiner has not provided the necessary evidence to show that the Weisman publication is prior art to the present application, the current rejection is improper.

**In the present Office Action, in response to the above arguments (response B),** the Examiner asserts "Applicants misunderstand section in MPEP titled 35 U.S.C. 119 Benefit of earlier filing date; right of priority". The Examiner then recites 35 U.S.C. 119(b)(1). This paragraph from 35 U.S.C. 119 has **nothing whatsoever to do** with the Applicants' above arguments. The relevant section of 35 U.S.C. 119 to the Weisman reference, as stated in the Applicants' above arguments, is U.S.C. 119(e)(1), not (b)(1). **Under 35 U.S.C. 119(e)(1), an application is not entitled to a provisional application's filing date as a prior art date unless at least one claim of the published utility application is supported (per 35 U.S.C. § 112) in the provisional application.** Applicants also direct the Examiner to M.P.E.P. § 2136.03(III-IV) and *In re Wertheim*, 209 USPQ 554 (CCPA 1981).

**Furthermore, regarding claim 1, even if Weisman did qualify as prior art, Weisman fails to disclose *wherein at least one of the one or more peer-to-peer***

*platform protocols is configured to be used by a peer node to discover peer nodes that are members of specified peer groups.* Weisman teaches a device hosting framework that provides hosting for software-implemented logical devices on a computer to expose their services as controlled devices per a peer networking protocol. Weisman's device hosting framework encapsulates discovery, description and control protocol operations so that developers do not have to individually implement the peer networking protocol in every logical device.

However, Weisman does not describe or teach anything regarding a peer-to-peer platform protocol configured to be used to discover peer nodes that are members of specified peer groups. Instead, Weisman teaches a discover protocol that allows hosted devices to broadcast a service advertisement that describes a service provided by the hosted device. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0045], [0839-0844], and [0849]). Nowhere does Weisman describe a peer-to-peer platform protocol that can be used to discover peer nodes that are members of particular peer groups, as in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner that anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every limitation of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. M.P.E.P 2131; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The **identical invention** must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed above, Weisman fails to disclose wherein at least one of the one or more peer-to-peer platform protocols is configured to be used by a peer node to discover peer nodes that are members of specified peer groups. Therefore, Weisman cannot be said to anticipate claim 1.

**In the present Office Action, in response to the above arguments (response C),** the Examiner asserts that “Applicants’ argument is inconsistent with claims. This/these limitation(s) are not found in the claims”, referring to the Applicants’ argument that Weisman fails to disclose “*wherein at least one of the one or more peer-to-*

*peer platform protocols is configured to be used by a peer node to discover **other** peer nodes that are members of specified peer groups.” Claim 1 recites “wherein at least one of the one or more peer-to-peer platform protocols is configured to be used by a peer node to discover peer nodes that are members of specified peer groups.” The only difference between the two clauses is that the first clause includes the word **other**. Applicants argument was simply pointing out the clear meaning of the claims. By definition discovery requires that something that is “other” than the discoverer is discovered. A peer node using a peer-to-peer platform to discover peer nodes that are members of specified peer groups must by definition discover other peer nodes. No “disclosure claimed in the specification” was read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art, as the Examiner erroneously alleges. Moreover, Weisman simply does not teach that *at least one of the one or more peer-to-peer platform protocols is configured to be used by a peer node to discover peer nodes that are members of specified peer groups*.*

**Thus, the Examiner’s response in (C) to the Applicants’ arguments is without merit, and the Examiner has not substantively responded to the Applicants’ arguments regarding claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have modified the above arguments to recite the claims language as used in claim 1.**

Thus, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claims 36, 59, 77 and 101.

**Regarding claim 53, the Examiner has failed to even attempt to provide a proper *prima facie* rejection of claim 53.** The Examiner merely asserts that claim 53 does “not define or teach any new limitations other than [the] above claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 15, 17-22, 25-30, and 32-35. However, the Examiner is improperly ignoring both the specific language and the particular limitations of claim 53 that are not recited in any of claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 15, 17-22, 25-30, and 32-35. Thus, the Examiner has clearly failed to provide a proper *prima facie* rejection of claim 53. As noted below, the Examiner has

also failed to provide a proper *prima facie* rejection of claims 55, 56, 57, 58, 73, 75, 76, 97, 99, 100, 114, 115 and 116.

**In further regard to claim 53, Weisman fails to disclose *wherein the peer node is configured to move from the network location to a different network location; wherein the program instructions are further executable within the peer node to discover and access a different instance of the service on a different one of the plurality of peer nodes.*** Claim 53 recites, in part, a peer node discovering and accessing an instance of a service on one of the peer nodes, moving to a different network location and discovering and accessing a *different instance of the service* on a different one of the peer nodes. The Examiner, as noted above, has not cited any portion of Weisman regarding these limitations of claim 53. Moreover, Weisman does not mention anything regarding a node moving to a different network location discovering and accessing a *different instance of the service on a different one of the plurality of peer nodes*.

Weisman describes the use of a device hosting framework providing hosting for software-implemented logical devices, but does not describe a peer node moving to a different network location. Nor does Weisman disclose a peer node discovering and accessing a different instance of the service on a different peer node.

As discussed above regarding claim 1, anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The **identical** invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed above, Weisman clearly fails to anticipate claim 53.

**In the present Office Action, in response to the above arguments (response D),** the Examiner asserts that “Applicants’ argument is inconsistent with claims. This/these limitation(s) are not found in the claims”, referring to the Applicants’

argument that Weisman fails to disclose “a peer node configured to move from the network location to a different network location and where the peer node is executable to discover and access a different instance of the service on a different one of the plurality of peer nodes.” Claim 53 recites “wherein the peer node is configured to move from the network location to a different network location; wherein the program instructions are further executable within the peer node to discover and access a different instance of the service on a different one of the plurality of peer nodes.” The differences between the two statements are clearly not substantive, and clearly do not change the scope of claim 53. No “disclosure claimed in the specification” was read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art, as the Examiner alleges.

**The Examiner’s response in (D) to the Applicants’ arguments is without merit, and the Examiner has not substantively responded to the Applicants’ arguments regarding claim 53. Furthermore, as noted above, the Examiner has failed to even attempt to provide a proper *prima facie* rejection of claim 53. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have modified the above arguments to recite the claims language as used in claim 53. This modification does not change the scope of the Applicants’ arguments.**

Thus, the rejection is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claims 73, 97 and 116.

Regarding claim 55, Weisman fails to disclose that *the different one of the plurality of peer nodes is operable to provide a unique identifier to the instance of the service hosted by the particular peer node, wherein the unique identifier distinguishes the different one of the plurality of peer nodes from the other peer nodes on the network; wherein the different one of the plurality of peer nodes is operable to move to a different network location; and wherein the instance of the service is operable to recognize the different one of the plurality of peer nodes using the unique identifier and to route information provided by the service to the different one of the plurality of peer nodes at the different network location.* Thus, claim 55 recites, part, peer nodes



providing access to an instance of service to a different one of the peer nodes. The different peer node is operable to *provide a unique identifier* to the instance of the service and *move to a different network location*. The instance of the service is operable to recognize the different peer node *using the unique identifier* and to route information to the different peer node at the different network address. As with claim 53, discussed above, the Examiner does not cite any portion of Weisman regarding these limitations of claim 55.

However, Weisman does not disclose anything regarding a peer node moving to a different network location. Nor does Weisman disclose anything regarding an instance of a service using a unique identifier provided by a peer node to recognize the peer node at a different network location and to route information to the different peer node at the different network address. The Examiner, regarding claim 35, relies on Weisman's UDN as a unique identifier. However, Weisman fails to disclose an instance of a service using the UDN to recognize a device that has moved to a different network location. In fact, as noted above, Weisman fails to disclose a node or device *moving to a different network location*.

Additionally, Weisman teaches, "[t]he foundation for UPnP networking is IP addressing" and that each device obtains an IP address either from a DHCP server or via an AutoIP process that "defines how a device intelligently chooses an IP address from a set of reserved addresses ..." (paragraph [0812]). Weisman clearly teaches the use of IP addresses which clearly cannot be used by an instance of the service to *recognize a peer node at a different network location* to which the peer node has moved, as recited in claim 55. Thus, Weisman ***teaches away*** from an instance of a service using a unique identifier provided by a peer node to recognize that peer node at a different network address to which the peer node has moved.

**In the present Office Action, in response to the above arguments (response E),** the Examiner asserts that "Applicants' argument is inconsistent with claims. This/these limitation(s) are not found in the claims", referring to the Applicants'

argument that Weisman fails to disclose “*the different one of the peer nodes is operable to provide a unique identifier to the instance of the service hosted by the particular peer node, where the unique identifier distinguishes the different one of the plurality of peer nodes from the other peer nodes on the network, move to a different network location, and where the instance of the service is operable to recognize the different one of the peer nodes using the unique identifier and to route information provided by the service to the different peer node at the different network location.*” Claim 55 recites “*the different one of the plurality of peer nodes is operable to provide a unique identifier to the instance of the service hosted by the particular peer node, wherein the unique identifier distinguishes the different one of the plurality of peer nodes from the other peer nodes on the network; wherein the different one of the plurality of peer nodes is operable to move to a different network location; and wherein the instance of the service is operable to recognize the different one of the plurality of peer nodes using the unique identifier and to route information provided by the service to the different one of the plurality of peer nodes at the different network location.*” The differences between the two statements are clearly not substantive, and clearly do not change the scope of claim 55. No “disclosure claimed in the specification” was read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art, as the Examiner alleges.

**The Examiner’s response in (E) to the Applicants’ arguments is without merit, and the Examiner has not substantively responded to the Applicants’ arguments regarding claim 55. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have modified the above arguments to recite the claims language as used in claim 55. This modification does not change the scope of the Applicants’ arguments.**

As discussed above regarding claim 1, anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The **identical invention** must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor*

Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed above, Weisman clearly fails to anticipate claim 55.

Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 55 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claims 56, 75, 99 and 115.

In regard to claim 57, Weisman fails to disclose wherein each of the plurality of peer nodes is configured to: discover and access an instance of the content on one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes, wherein the one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes is local to a network location of the particular peer node on the network, wherein said discovering and accessing the instance of the content is performed in accordance with the one or more peer-to-peer platform protocols; move from the network location to a different network location; discover and access a different instance of the content on a different one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes. As noted above, Weisman fails to disclose anything a device or node moving to a different network location. Please refer to the discussion of claims 53 and 55 above for a more detailed discussion of Weisman's failure to teach anything regarding a device or node moving to a different network location.

Additionally in regard to claim 57, Weisman fails to disclose wherein each of the plurality of peer nodes is configured to: discover and access an instance of the content on one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes, wherein the one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes is local to a network location of the particular peer node on the network, wherein said discovering and accessing the instance of the content is performed in accordance with the one or more peer-to-peer platform protocols; move from the network location to a different network location; discover and access a *different instance* of the content on a different one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes. The Examiner has not cited any portion of Weisman that mention anything regarding a peer node discovering and

accessing a *different instance* of content on a different peer node after moving to a different network location, as recited in claim 57.

**In the present Office Action, in response to the above arguments (response F),** the Examiner asserts that “Applicants’ argument is inconsistent with claims. This/these limitation(s) are not found in the claims”, referring to the Applicants’ arguments that Weisman fails to disclose “*a peer node discovering and accessing an instance of a content on one of the peer nodes, moving to a different network location and discovering and accessing a different instance of the content on a different one of the peer nodes*” and that Weisman fails to disclose “*a peer node discovering and accessing an instance of a content on one peer node, moving to a different network location and discovering and accessing a different instance of content on a different peer node*”. **The Examiner cites an incomplete portion of claim 57.** The relevant portion of Claim 57 recites “*wherein each of the plurality of peer nodes is configured to: discover and access an instance of the content on one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes, wherein the one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes is local to a network location of the particular peer node on the network, wherein said discovering and accessing the instance of the content is performed in accordance with the one or more peer-to-peer platform protocols; move from the network location to a different network location; discover and access a different instance of the content on a different one of the at least a subset of the plurality of peer nodes.*” **The substance of both of the two statements made in the arguments are recited in the cited portion of claim 57 without referring to the specification.** The two statements simply summarize content found in claim 57, and add no new scope to the claim. Any differences between the first two statements and the latter are clearly not substantive, and clearly do not change the scope of claim 57. No “disclosure claimed in the specification” was read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art, as the Examiner alleges.

**The Examiner’s response in (F) to the Applicants’ arguments is without merit, and the Examiner has not substantively responded to the Applicants’ arguments regarding claim 57. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have**

**modified the above arguments to recite the claims language as used in claim 57. This modification does not change the scope of the Applicants' arguments.**

As discussed above regarding claim 1, anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The **identical invention** must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed above, Weisman clearly fails to anticipate claim 57.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 57 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claims 58, 76, 100 and 114.

**Section 103(a) Rejection:**

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 7, 14, 16, 23, 24, 31, 39, 43, 46, 61, 64, 81, 85, 88, 91, 102, 105 and 109 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weisman in view of Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,490,618) (hereinafter "Ferguson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 4, 7, 14, 16, 23, 24, 31, 39, 43, 46, 61, 64, 81, 85, 88, 91, 102, 105 and 109 for at least the reasons presented above regarding their respective independent claims.

Applicants also assert, regarding both the § 102 and § 103 rejections, that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

**Claims Objected To but Otherwise Allowable:**

Claims 6 and 41 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-06800/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255  
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: July 2, 2007